

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION

ANTHIMOS GOGOS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 13 C 3779
	)	
AMS-MECHANICAL SYSTEM, INC.,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

MEMORANDUM ORDER

This Court has repeatedly tried to explain to pro se plaintiff Anthimos Gogos ("Gogos") that his grievance against his ex-employer AMS-Mechanical System, Inc. cannot be pursued in this federal court under the auspices of the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA")--an explanation attempted by this Court's "Order I" issued on June 5, 2013 its "Order II" issued on July 11 and its "Order III" issued on July 25. Nothing daunted, on August 2 Gogos submitted an 18-page filing (Dkt. 26) "that I would like to be included on the record cornering [sic] this case before transfer to the appeal court."

In that most recent filing Gogos has again acknowledged forthrightly that he does not understand what this Court has sought unsuccessfully to convey to him. And what this most recent filing further reflects is that although Gogos may indeed have been sick at the time of termination of his employment, his problem remains that he does not qualify as having had a "disability"--a term of art under the ADA.

Accordingly the final sentence of Order III ("Gogos' proposed lawsuit under the Act remains dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction") is still accurate. Finally, because the Clerk's Office current printout of motions assertedly pending in cases assigned to this Court's calendar still includes Gogos' "Motion To Appeal Your Decision from Last June 5-2013 That You Terminate My Case" (Dkt. 12), a few words should be said on that score.

Despite the quoted caption of that document, in large part it reads like a communication to this Court asking for the reinstatement of Gogos' case and the appointment of a lawyer to represent him. What has been said earlier in this memorandum order reconfirms the reasons for denying such reinstatement, while the second aspect should be directed to the Court of Appeals in connections with Gogos' appeal. Accordingly a "Motion To Appeal..." is unnecessary, while the other aspects of the Dkt. 12 submission are denied.



---

Milton I. Shadur  
Senior United States District Judge

Date: August 22, 2013